



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

lished beyond reasonable doubt. Flaubert, engaged upon *Novembre* in 1842, can not completely have forgotten the book which so strongly determined his work between 1838 and 1839. Therefore, nothing seems more probable than that the passage quoted from Quinet should have furnished a suggestion for Flaubert's next step.

ALICE P. F. HUBBARD.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

---

### REVIEWS

*Mittelniederdeutsche Grammatik*, von AGATHE LASCH. Halle, Niemeyer, 1914. (Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte ix.)

The last twenty years have seen the gradual entrance of women into the field of philology, a domain which had hitherto been almost exclusively cultivated by men. A number of able dissertations and other smaller contributions have appeared from the pens of women, but as far as I know, this grammar of Middle Low German is the most pretentious piece of philological work attempted by a woman. Moreover, the attempt was of special difficulty, as the Low German field has been rather neglected, when compared with the attention paid to Gothic, Old High and Middle High German. Very little has been done in the way of investigation of the use of individual chancelleries and of their relations to each other. What grammars there were, such as K. Nерger's *Grammatik des mecklenburgischen Dialektes älterer und neuerer Zeit*, 1869, and Lübben's *Mittelniederdeutsche Grammatik*, 1882, were antiquated and superficial. Lübben's work especially was invalidated by his refusal to recognize the presence of the umlauts of *o* and *u*. Miss Lasch prepared herself for her larger work by a study of the *Schriftsprache in Berlin bis zur Mitte des 16. Jh.*, 1910. In the present work, although laboring under peculiar difficulties, being able to investigate *an Ort und Stelle* only in her summer vacations, she has produced a grammar which takes its place worthily at the side of the other grammars of the series. The word *kurz* in the title of the series is somewhat of a misnomer when applied to such grammars as Braune's *Ahd. Grammatik*

which is invaluable for its wealth of detail. So this work of Lasch of nearly 300 pages, 190 of which are devoted to the phonology, with its valuable system of cross references, is comprehensive rather than brief.

The author has wisely based her work on the *Urkunden*, letters and other prose texts of the period, especially on those connected with the chancelleries, as being less subject to High German influence than verse was, as shown by Roethe in his *Reimvorreden*. She has cleverly disarmed criticism by calling attention to the fact, that owing to the lack of preliminary investigations (*Vorarbeiten*) her work must be considered merely an *Anregung für weiteres Schaffen*. Nevertheless the author has not contented herself with writing a merely descriptive grammar, the easiest and safest thing to do under the circumstances, but has had the courage to treat the speech phenomena in most cases historically and to venture explanations of the causes of the many sound changes. One feels on almost every page that she has had to make these decisions by herself on the basis of the material collected, with little or no help from others. Under such conditions it is but natural that here and there one may differ from the author, believe that her conclusions are false or at least too hasty, or that her presentation is unclear. Behaghel in his review (*Litbl.* 1915, 76-82) has called attention to a number of such cases. The following have occurred to me in reading through the work:

On p. 51 in speaking of the lengthening of a vowel before  $r + n$  or  $d$ , Lasch remarks that the introduction of an  $e$  between  $r$  and  $n$ , e. g. in *koren*, proves this. There is no doubt, of course, that the vowels were lengthened in such cases, as shown by such spellings as *peerde*, *geern*, etc., but I fail to see how the introduction of  $e$  between the consonants proves this, at least it does not in other dialects. Thus it is frequent in older Upper German owing to the reluctance to pronounce such consonants together, but there is no indication that the vowel in such cases is lengthened, cf. Braune, *Ahd. Gr.* p. 61.

§ 79 we read: '*har* < *her* in älteren texten ist vortonige entwicklung; vgl. *antwer* usw. § 221, III.' These two phenomena can not, however, be compared, as in *antwer*, as Lasch herself points out, we have the retention of original  $a$ , but in *har*  $a$  is developed from  $e$  before  $r$ .

In § 83 Lasch explains the forms *derf* and *der* as due partly to enclisis or proclisis, partly to the influence of *r*, especially of *r* + cons. This latter development is, however, rare, as L. herself confesses, § 77. Generally the reverse is the case. As to its being a weakening due to the lack of emphasis this is even more doubtful. No other preterite-present verbs show such weakenings and in general these verbs are too important in meaning to be unstressed. To my mind a much simpler explanation would be to consider *derf* and *der* as due to analogy with the plural forms *derven* and *derren* which occur as variants of *dörven* and *dörren*, cf. § 442. On the other hand, the adverb *der* given in Anm. 1 as a weakening of *dar* is correctly explained. It occurs already in O. S. (Holt-hausen § 125) and is frequent in M. H. G.

§ 96 we read: 'auffallend sind einige male die schreibungen *au* vor *ld*.' To judge by the remarks that follow, L. does not seem to recognize this wide-spread change of *a* to *au* before *ld* which is common in Scotch (*auld*, etc.) and in Dutch (*out* 'old,' *houden* 'hold,' etc., cf. Franck, *Mndl. Gr.* § 50). It is also found in Silesian texts of the 14th and 15th centuries, probably through the influence of the Dutch colonization (Weinhold, *Mhd. Gr.* § 37).

§ 121. In his review Behaghel considers the following statement difficult to understand: 'Einsilbige wörter vom typus *êt* 'eid' scheinen vielfach unter dem ton gedehnt zu sein. Mit auffallend häufigem *eit* (mit *ei*) vgl. bei Oldecop *ehit* 'eid.' I suppose Lasch means that the spelling *ehit* would indicate that the *ê* was drawled and changed to a long diphthong *êi*. To my mind, however, the frequent occurrence of *eit* makes it natural to suspect H. G. influence which is undoubtedly the cause for the appearance of *heit* in syllables with secondary stress instead of the usual *hêt*. Behaghel is right in considering Lasch's remark on this in § 122 incorrect. That *ei* and *ê* should occasionally occur side by side as given in § 123 need not surprise us. The difference between *ê* and *ei* was so slight in the older language that they are frequently confused in H. G. dialects where no L. G. influence is possible (cf. Braune § 44 anm. 4). L. herself says, § 23: die scheidung von *ê*, *ei* ist mnd. orthographisch nicht deutlich. In some cases in M. L. G. the *i* might be explained as in § 22 as *ein nachgeschriebener vokal*.

In § 166 we miss an explanation of the wide-spread appearance

of *ou* for *ô* in older texts. Lübben explains it as due to a drawling pronunciation (*breite, gezogene Aussprache*) and not to the influence of H. G. We have here undoubtedly the first orthographical evidences of the development of *ô* to *ou* or *au* which also characterizes English and occurs in three out of the four main divisions of the modern L. G. dialects (Cf. Grimme, *Plattdeutsche Mundarten*, § 59).

§ 172 we read: 'Die bedingungen unter denen *wi-* > *u* wurde, sind noch nicht sicher erkannt. Wahrscheinlich vor ursprünglich folgendem dunklem vokal, etc.' To my mind the change does not depend principally on the vowel or consonant that follows, but upon the preceding *w*, which everywhere tends to labialize a following palatal vowel, as in H. G. (*würde* < *wirde*, *zwölf* < *zwelf*). H. G. always retains the *w*, but many languages drop it as soon as the vowel has assumed the *w*-quality. This is especially the case when *w* is medial after consonant. In the words for 'sister' this is true of practically all the Germanic languages except H. G. (M. E. *suster* < *sweostor*; Dutch *zuster*; Danish *søster*; Swedish *syster*; Icel. *systir*; Rip. *söster*. Swedish shows the same phenomenon in *tolf* 'twelve'). That the change in *süster* is more consistent and general than in *tüschén*, is probably due to the fact that it had no related word at its side to exert a corrective influence. In *tüschén* for *twischen* the word for 'two' with which it was felt to be connected either helped to retain the *w* or to reinstate it after it had already been lost, as in the case of the form *twüschén*. The labialization of *i* to *ü* was probably aided by the *sch* of the word, which has a rounded pronunciation in German dialects (Viëtor, *Phonetik* p. 184). The form *schöpen* for *schepen* admits of the same explanation, aided by the labial character of *p*. The consonant *s* itself may have had a labializing effect in L. G. as in M. L. Fr. (Cf. Franck, *Mln. Gr.* § 55) and the forms *sös*, *söstich* and *söder* < *seder* may be accounted for in that way.

In § 227 the *ss* of the pronoun *desse*, *düsse* is explained as the assimilation of the dative cases, O. S. *thesemu* and *thesaro* becoming respectively *desme* and *desre*, from which the stem *dess-* is then derived. This theory is ingenious, but I can recall no case in which *sm* or *sr* assimilate to *ss*. On the contrary *sm* becomes *mm* by assimilation, as in Gothic *þamma* when compared with Sanscrit *tasmai*; *sr* becomes *rr*, as in M. H. G. dat. fem. *dirre*. If, as gen-

erally assumed, the pronoun *desse* is composed of *þe* + *se*, then the *ss* form is probably due to the influence of the gen. sing. masc. or neuter with internal inflection, i. e. *þes* + *se*. This form does not occur, it is true, in O. S., as far as the literary monuments go, but might have existed, just as it did in O. H. G. *desse*. Cf. Kluge, *Urg.* p. 212; Braune, *Ahd. Gr.*<sup>3</sup> p. 240.

§ 231. How does L. know that metathesis is dependent on the development of a secondary vowel? Sievers in his *Phonetik*, § 771, says nothing of such a cause, but speaks merely of a 'Vertauschung der Reihenfolge (wie *bersten* aus *brestan*)'; nor is any such reason given either by Franck, *Mnl. Gr.* § 105 or by Wilmanns, *Gr.* 1, § 159 in their treatments of metathesis. As is well known it is common both in English and Dutch where the development of secondary vowels is rare.

In § 232 it would be better for the sake of clearness to separate Primitive Germanic consonant gemination from the West Germanic, as Braune has done, *Ahd. Gr.*<sup>3</sup> § 95 seq. Especially confusing to the beginner is the placing of the examples of P. G. gemination after those of W. G., whereas in the text above the processes are mentioned in their chronological order.

In § 261 L. treats one of the most difficult and puzzling problems of L. G. philology, the disappearance of the nasals *m*, *n* before the spirants *f*, *þ*, *s*. Especially difficult is the question of the disappearance of *n* before *þ*, as the modern dialects are not in accord with the O. S., or at any rate with the dialect of the *Heliand*, in this particular. Such forms as O. S. *ððar* stand in sharp opposition to M. L. G. *ander* and to the various modern forms with *n*, but agree rather with the Anglo-Frisian branch. Various explanations have been suggested. Collitz, (*Pub. M. L. A.* xvi, 131; *Wald. Wb.* p. 70 seq.) considers the O. S. forms to show the influence of a Frisian literary dialect. Bremer, (*Pauls Grdr.*<sup>2</sup> 1, 866,) thinks the distinction a social one, that a few prominent families spread the Anglo-Frisian dialect over all the Saxon lands. Mutschmann, (*Beitr.* xxxii, 544 seq.), believes that *n* was first dropped everywhere before *þ*, but that when *þ* became *d*, that *n* was reinstated. I agree with Lasch on this point that it is better to assume that the forms with and without the nasal existed side by side. The nasal form must have always existed among the people and have been spoken by them. Temporarily it was crowded out of the lit-

erature in the O. S. period under the influence of a literary or social norm, to reappear again in M. L. G. after this influence had waned, just as the dual forms of the personal pronoun were preserved for hundreds of years among the people of Bavaria without a trace of them being seen in the literature.

In the case of *n* before *s* the development seems to have been more consistent, altho *n* forms appear here too. In the dialects of the old Saxon land the *n* seems to have been universally lost before *s*: where it appears it is probably due to foreign influence, either Low Franconian or High German, in both of which *n* was retained. The *s/n* line, as Wrede remarks (*Anz.* 18,405), is 'ein herkömmlisches unterscheidungsmerkmal zwischen nd. und md.' On page 406 he further states that the line marks a fundamental difference between the dialects of the old *Stammland* and those of the younger colonial lands in the east. To my mind these two circumstances give the key to the situation and indicate that the retention of *n* is due to outside influence. Lasch seems to think that *n* was regularly retained in the plural of the word for 'goose,' but lost in the singular, to judge by her remark: 'das zu erwartende *gense* ist noch oft erhalten: Prignitz sg. *gôs*, pl. *gäns*.' Under the declension of the feminine *i*-stems, however, she says nothing of a change in the plural. Without having been able to investigate the matter in detail, it seems to me in view of the modern forms (Grimme § 127 gives no instance of a sing. or plur. with *n* and Wrede makes no distinction between sing. and plur.) extremely doubtful that *n* was retained in the plural as opposed to the sing. That *n* should appear in the colonial lands, as in Prignitz, is but natural, as they stood under the influence of the Dutch. Where, however, the country was settled by people of Saxon origin, as in Mecklenburg, the word appears without *n*, as L. shows. As to *uns*, *unser*: *ûs*, *ûser*, the fact that the literary form exhibits *n*, while the one without *n* is the colloquial word (*Sprechform*), seems again to point to foreign influence. In Brandenburg and in Westphalia, where Dutch influence was strong, we learn from Lasch that in the one case *uns* was the regular form, in the other it predominated. It is to be regretted that L. with the wealth of material she has collected did not investigate the matter thoroughly with the idea of throwing more light upon the word, which, as Collitz (*Wald. Wb.* p. 61) says: 'noch sehr der Aufhellung bedarf.' We hope that she will take the question under consideration.

In § 298 Anm. we read: 'Mnd. inlautend *v* zeigt heute sehr verschiedene entwicklung: teils ist es labiodentaler spirant, teils entwickelt es sich zum verschlusslaut *b*, teils ist es ganz geschwunden.' For those who are not as familiar with the modern L. G. as the author, it would be well to give examples of these various developments of *v*, especially as in § 290 Anm: 2 the appearance of *b* for *v* in early texts is considered to be due to H. G. influence, and Grimme, § 104, states that *v* remains in modern L. G. when medial as *w*, except before *η*.

In § 308 the remark: 'In weitem umfange ist die öffnung des dentalen verschlusses nach einem auslautenden dental schriftlich fixiert' would be clearer if the word *nasal* were introduced, as it is the question not of any dental closure, but only of the dental nasal. Not until the reader glances at the examples does he see what is really meant. Similarly the sentence: 'Interkonsonantischer dental fällt zuweilen' would be improved by the addition of the word *aus*, as this phenomenon is usually termed *ausfall*. In the same paragraph two sentences seem to contradict each other, unless I have failed to catch the drift: 'Besonders oft ist *t* nach *ch* und *f* ausgefallen' and 'Inlautend wie auslautend scheint die nachbarschaft eines dentalen den ausfall zu begünstigen.' If a dental favors the syncope of *t*, then one is surprised to learn that it takes place so frequently after *ch* and *f*. It seems to me that we have to do here with two entirely different phenomena. In the case of *is* for *ist* and *sin* for *sint* we have the same reluctance to end a dental spirant with a dental stop when the word is unstressed that we have in English and Dutch and which has made *is* the standard form in these two languages, whereas in H. G. with its crisper and sharper enunciation the *t* has been retained in *ist*. For the same reason *t* is dropped in the unstressed word *sint*, just as in Danish *d* is not pronounced in such compound numerals as *tresindstyve*, although it is still written. On the other hand, in the case of *t* disappearing after *ch* or *f*, it is the difficult consonant combination caused by the difference of articulation which produces the syncope of *t*. This is the only condition involved, as Moser points out (*Einführung in die frühnhd. Schriftdialekte* § 115: 'nach schwerer Konsonanz.') It is found in all dialects, cf. *mark* for *markt*; *achzig* for *achtzig*; *willpraete* for *wiltpraete*; *Hauptmann* for *Hauptmann*, etc. Lübben, p. 47, remarks: 'Es muss der nhd. Zunge schon früh wie heute schwer gefallen sein, das *t* nach *ch*



ordentlich zu Gehör zu bringen.' In the same paragraph and in § 230 Lasch calls the disappearance of *t* in *beste* < *betste*, *leste* < *letste* a kind of dissimilation. Again I must differ, for to my mind it is not dissimilation but rather assimilation which causes the *t* to disappear. Holthausen, § 239, speaks merely of the *Schwund des t*, but both Paul, *Mhd. Gr.* § 71, 2 and Wilmanns, *Deutsche Gr.* I. § 161 treat of it as assimilation.

In § 337 we read: '*k* > *ch* nach *i* in unbetonter stellung: *-ik* > *-ich* in der silbe *-lik*, etc.' It seems to me that it may be fairly well doubted, whether this is a regular sound change, as Lasch seems to think. Lübben, p. 57, states that the ending is regularly *-lik*, but that it is occasionally written *-lich* by false analogy with the ending *-ich* (mhd. *-ic*), which in turn by false analogy appears as *-ik*. That we have to do here with a confusion of the two suffixes *-lik* and *-ig* is shown by the fact that in the longer form *-liken* the *k* is often written *g* (*-ligen*), since *k* does not otherwise appear as *g* between vowels (cf. Lasch § 335). If the change were a regular one, then we should expect to find it in the pronoun *ik*, as this is frequently unstressed. Lasch, however, does not consider such forms as *ich*, *ech*, to be L. G. If that is the case with *ich*, then it is also likely to be true of *sich* for *sik*. Grimme § 108 states that the suffix appears as *-lik* in the Assinghausen and Ostbevern groups of dialects, but *-lich* in the Stavenhagen group and *-li* (< *-lich*) in the Heide group. Again, however, the confusion in the latter case is shown by the fact that medially it appears as *-lig*. A confusion with the suffix *-ig* would of course account for *ch*, as *g* is always written *ch* when final. There is still, however, another possible interpretation of the *ch*, which L. herself suggests in connection with the pronoun *ich*, namely, that *ch* might stand here for *kh*, i. e. an aspirated *k*. In § 336 she calls attention to the fact that *k* when final often appears as *ch* = *c* (*volch*, *dinch*). She then continues: 'Hiernach wird auch *ch* nach vokal zu beurteilen sein, und es wird sich in dem häufigen *ôch* nicht immer um spiranten handeln müssen.' In the case of *sprach: sprechen* which she explains together with *shê* and *vhê* as an instance of the tendency to lengthen short words by the addition of *h*, the *ch* should be rather explained as in *volch*. As to the names compounded with *-rik*, they, too, can be similarly explained as *ch* for final *k*, or as H. G. influence, which as we have seen, is strong in family names.

In § 351 we read: 'Auslautendes *ch* nach konsonant oder langem vokal wurde früh zum hauchlaut und schwand.' As the only instance of *ch* disappearing after consonant, which L. is able to adduce, is *beval* and she herself is not certain but what this is an 'ausgleich nach dem inlaut,' it seems to me it would be better to state that *ch* disappeared after a long vowel and then give *beval* as a doubtful case of the same thing happening after consonant. Behaghel asks in his review, how L. knows that *ch* became a 'hauchlaut' before disappearing. To my mind L. is right here, for this is the only possible physiological explanation of the dropping of *ch* in such cases, just as in the frequent instances in H. G. This is best seen when medial, as for example when the *h* of M. H. G. *stahel* gradually loses its spirant character, so that the word becomes the monosyllabic N. H. G. *stahl*, where *h* is retained merely as a sign of length.

§ 361. As the nom. and acc. of neuter *e/o* stems were already identical in the primitive Indo-European period it is hardly a correct way of putting it to say, as L. does in this paragraph, that the nom. and acc. sing. of masculine and neuters had fallen together, as if it had taken place at the same time.

§ 362 in speaking of the retention of the thematic vowels of *i* and *u* stems in O. S. (*kuri*, *sunu*) it would have been well for the sake of accuracy to have mentioned that this was the case only with short stems.

§ 382 something should have been said about the dropping of *n* in the acc. sing. of fem. weak nouns (*tunge*). This is especially striking, as the *n* was retained in the parallel case of the weak adjective in M. L. G. In H. G. the *n* persisted through the M. H. G. period and in fact down to the end of the 18th century, as many cases in Goethe's works show. The *n* was of course dropped through analogy with the nominative case, as stated by Wilmanns, III, 2, p. 394.

In the treatment of the cardinals we read § 396, Anm. 4 that the gen. plur. *twîger* cannot be derived from O. S. *twoio*, but must have been modeled on *drîger*. This is false, as *drîger* occurs in O. S. just as little as *twîger* does. The gen. plur. of 'three' does not occur in our O. S. documents, but Holthausen, § 379 gives the starred form *\*thrîo* on the analogy of O. H. G. *drîo*. The *er* form of M. L. G. in both words is due to the influence of the gen. plur. of the adjective in *er(e)*. In O. H. G., Tatian uses *zweiero* and

from the eleventh century on *driero* is found. The *er* form became the prevailing one in M. H. G. as in M. L. G. See Braune, *Ahd. Gr.* § 270, anm. 2 and 4 and also Wilmanns III, 2, p. 445.

In § 422 in the treatment of the 2d sing. pret. of strong verbs one misses a statement to the effect that the O. S. form ending in *i*, with its pret. subj. vowel had been given up in favor of the *-est* (*-es*) of the weak verbs. It is true that L. does not in all cases trace the forms from the O. S., but she does it so frequently that it would be well to make her practice uniform, especially as such an historical treatment adds immeasurably to the value of any grammatical treatise.

The proof-reading of the grammar has not been as careful as in the case of most books printed in Germany, which is partly due, as the author explains, to her great distance from the printer. In addition to the many errata given on pp. 285-286, I have noted the following: p. 75 l. 3 read § 403a2 for 402 a. 5; § 244, l. 1 read *nach* for *noch*; § 271 *nn* > *nd* should read *nn* < *nd*, cf. § 323 and § 261 anm. 3.; p. 172, l. 6 from below read *anlehnung* for *ahnlehnung*; § 404 anm. 1 read § 403 for § 402.

Altho I have felt it necessary to differ with L. in the points treated above, I do not wish to be thought as belittling the admirable work that the author has done. One has only to open the book at random and to compare any treatment with the corresponding one in Lübben to be convinced of the great advance which this grammar denotes. Where Lübben contents himself with a few general and often vague remarks we find here a wealth of detail. The sounds are treated from every point of view and the thorough system of cross references will make the book invaluable as a reference work. Especially good is the discussion of the umlauts of *u* and *o* which L. conclusively proves to have existed in M. L. G., tho Lübben denied it. No less than twelve pages are devoted to umlaut as compared to five in Lübben. Excellent is also the treatment of grammatical change in § 226 and that as a principle regulating the alternation of *d* and *t*, *f* and *v*, it gave way to the laws of finals. The detailed statistics of the change of *th* to *d*, § 319, are of decided value for students. Lübben gives practically nothing but the mere statement of the fact. The introduction and the general treatment of the period, including the question of the literary norm and the orthography, is well written, accurate and succinct in its statements. In addition the work is

provided with an excellent bibliography and a good word-index. Syntax is not treated, but the author is evidently following here the tradition set by Braune in the same series. The most original and on that account the most debatable part of the grammar is that in which L. states her views as to the development of the long monophthongs in L. G. Deviating from the ordinary view, she considers them secondary. Instead of thinking that the so-called *tonlange vokale* were simply the lengthening of short vowels in open accented syllable, she believes that diphthongs first appeared, which were later simplified to monophthongs. On this account she rejects the expression *tondehnung* and *tonlange vokale* and substitutes that of *zerdehnung*. This view is not entirely new, as Jostes criticized the older belief nearly thirty years ago (*Nd. Jb.* XI, 91) and Collitz (*Wald. Wb.*, p. 6) says: 'man darf mit gleichem Rechte annehmen, die nordsächs. einfachen Tonlängen seien aus Diphthongen . . . hervorgegangen.' Collitz therefore suggested the expressions *verstärkte Vokale* or *gesteigerte Vokale* in place of *tonlange*. The older view, however, still held the field and Lasch, evidently feeling that her theory might arouse opposition, explained it and developed it at length before the appearance of her grammar in an article, *Beitr.* XXXIX, 116-133. Her fears proved true, as it has resulted in a somewhat acrimonious discussion. Frings attacked her rather unkindly, *Beitr.* XL, 112-126 and she answered *ibid.*, p. 304, deprecating his arrogance, but defending her position vigorously and convincingly. Thus far she seems to have had the better of the argument. The courteous character of her reply wins the sympathy of the reader and convinces him that the advent of women in the field of philology is a good thing, if it will put an end to the supercilious and discourteous tone which unfortunately too often disfigures articles written by German scholars.

DANIEL BUSSIER SHUMWAY.

*University of Pennsylvania.*

---

*An Italian Dictionary* by ALFRED HOARE, M. A. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1915.

At last an excellent Italian-English Dictionary. This is the impression one gets even from a rapid glance at Mr. Hoare's book. It is ample, yet of reasonable size; it is printed and bound hand-